IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

EDDIE J. STREETER, JR.,) No. C 04-3969 CW (PR)
Plaintiff,) ORDER DIRECTING DEFENDANTS TO) FILE RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S
V.) REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA, ET AL.,))
Defendants.)

Plaintiff Eddie J. Streeter, Jr., a state prisoner, filed this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging violations of his constitutional rights when he was incarcerated at the Santa Clara County Main Jail. In September, 2006, the parties reached a confidential settlement agreement. A Stipulation and Order Dismissing the Case was signed by all parties, and the case was dismissed with prejudice on September 20, 2006.

Before the Court is Plaintiff's motion entitled, "Ex Parte Motion (Breach of Contract)." He has also filed a document entitled, "Writ Mandate Re: Payment Order (Breach of Contract)." Plaintiff claims that he had agreed to a sum of \$49,600.00. He claims that he became suspicious a few years ago after not having received his settlement check. He also alleges he wrote four separate letters over the past four years in an attempt to receive his settlement payment. He claims that Defendants' insurance company sent a check in the amount of \$46,000.00 to his home address and made it payable to his father, "Eddie J. Streeter Sr." Plaintiff argues that this is a breach of their settlement agreement. It seems that Plaintiff's father cashed the check, claiming that it was in his name and for his personal use.

Plaintiff is now attempting to reclaim his settlement payment because he will soon be released from prison. The Court construes Plaintiff's motion as a request for reconsideration.

Where the Court's ruling has resulted in a final judgment or order, as here, a motion for reconsideration may be based either on Rule 59(e) (motion to alter or amend judgment) or Rule 60(b) (motion for relief from judgment) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Because Plaintiff's motion was not filed within ten days of entry of judgment, as is required for a Rule 59(e) motion, it will be treated as a Rule 60(b) motion.

Rule 60(b) provides for reconsideration where one or more of the following is shown: (1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise or excusable neglect; (2) newly discovered evidence which by due diligence could not have been discovered before the Court's decision; (3) fraud by the adverse party; (4) the judgment is void; (5) the judgment has been satisfied; (6) any other reason justifying relief. Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b); School Dist. 1J v. ACandS Inc., 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993). "Rule 60(b) [] provides a mechanism for parties to seek relief from a judgment when 'it is no longer equitable that the judgment should have prospective application,' or when there is any other reason justifying relief from judgment." Jeff D. v. Kempthorne, 365 F.3d 844, 853-54 (9th Cir. 2004) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)).

Subparagraph (6) requires a showing that the grounds justifying relief are extraordinary. "'[T]he major grounds that justify reconsideration involve an intervening change of controlling law, the availability of new evidence, or the need to correct a clear error or prevent manifest injustice.'" Pyramid

Lake Paiute Tribe of Indians v. Hodel, 882 F.2d 364, 369 n.5 (9th Cir. 1989) (quoting <u>United States v. Desert Gold Mining Co.</u>, 433 F.2d 713, 715 (9th Cir. 1970)).

Here, Plaintiff seems to be making a motion for reconsideration under Rule 60(b)(6), which, as mentioned above, allows cases to be reopened under "extraordinary circumstances," including where the repudiation of a settlement agreement resulted in complete frustration of the settlement and circumstances indicate bad faith noncompliance with the settlement. Before the Court considers Plaintiff's motion, it directs Defendants to file a response to his request for reconsideration.

No later than three (3) days from the date of this Order,
Defendants shall file a response to Plaintiff's "Ex Parte Motion
(Breach of Contract)" (docket no. 73) and his "Writ Mandate Re:
Payment Order (Breach of Contract)" (docket no. 74).

If Plaintiff wishes to reply to Defendants' response, he shall do so no later than <u>fourteen (14) days</u> from the date Defendants' response is filed.

The motion for reconsideration shall be deemed submitted as of the date the reply brief is due. No hearing will be held on the motion unless the Court so orders at a later date.

The Clerk of the Court is directed to send Defendants' attorney copies of the documents mentioned above (docket nos. 73, 74).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 2/14/2011

United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3

1

2

STREETER,

v.

Plaintiff,

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS et al,

Defendant.

COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

4 5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

Case Number: CV04-03969 CW

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

That on February 14, 2011, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office.

Eddie J. Streeter V-17183 CA State Prison - Corcoran B2-02-243 P.O. Box 3461 Corcoran, CA 93212

Dated: February 14, 2011

Richard W. Wieking, Clerk By: Nikki Riley, Deputy Clerk